REMARKS

With this response, claims 17-48 are pending. Claim 43 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamp (U.S. Patent No. 4,844,358). Claims 17-42 and 44-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wassenhoven, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,509,261) in view of Kamp.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kamp does not anticipate claim 43 because Kamp does not disclose all the limitations set forth in claim 43. Claim 43 calls for an apparatus for use in a spinning place of a textile machine. The apparatus includes a modularly structured, exchangeable winding unit for winding thread within the spinning place. Applicants respectfully submit that Kamp does not disclose a modularly structured, exchangeable winding unit for winding thread within the spinning place in which the winding unit resides.

Kamp discloses a winding machine that is a separate machine from the spinning machine, which spins the yarn that the winding machine winds onto a package. The winding machine has only individual winding places therein with each individual winding place being removable in its entirety. The winding machine does not have a spinning place. A winding place on the winding machine only rewinds existing yarn from a bobbin to a package, whereas a spinning place within a spinning machine spins individual fibers into a continuous yarn thereby creating the yarn itself. Each winding place receives bobbins of yarn from ring spinning frames. These bobbins are hand-delivered or run along a linked conveyor system between the ring spinning frames and a winding machine. Therefore, each winding place within the winding machine of Kamp is not included in an individual spinning place of a spinning machine. Rather, the winding

machine receives bobbins of yarn from a plurality of ring spinning places from several spinning frames. Since the modular winding place of Kamp is within a winding machine and not within a single spinning place of a textile machine, Kamp cannot anticipate claim 43.

Further, independent claims 17, 26, 32, and 44 are not rendered obvious by Wassenhoven, et al. in view of Kamp. Claim 17 calls for a textile machine for spinning fiber material into thread. The textile machine has a plurality of spinning places with each of the plurality of spinning places including a can feeding device, a modularly structured, exchangeable spinning unit, and a winding unit. Claim 26 calls for a textile machine for spinning fiber material into a thread with the textile machine having a plurality of spinning places. Each spinning place includes a can feeding device, a spinning unit, and a modularly structured and exchangeable winding unit. Claim 32 calls for a textile machine for spinning fiber material into a thread with a textile machine having a plurality of spinning places. Each spinning place includes a can feeding device, a modularly structured, exchangeable spinning unit, and a modularly structured, exchangeable winding unit. Claim 44 calls for an apparatus for use in a spinning place of a textile machine that includes a modularly structured, exchangeable spinning unit that is positionable in and removable from the spinning place. Each of these claims calls for at least one of the driven components within each spinning place to be modular.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to modify Wassenhoven, et al. with Kamp in a manner that would render independent claims 17, 26, 32, and 44 obvious. Further, applicants submit that the combination of

Wassenhoven, et al. in view of Kamp does not disclose, teach, or suggest modularity of individual driven components within a spinning place.

Wassenhoven, et al. discloses individual spinning stations within a rotor spinning machine. The spinning station includes operational components arranged in the spinning box for drawing in sliver, opening the sliver, and feeding the fibers into a rotor for spinning the fiber into a yarn. The spinning station also includes a winding drum which winds the yarn onto a package. The spinning station is a single, integral spinning place with the spinning unit and the winding unit not being separable from the rest of the spinning station.

As stated above, Kamp discloses a winding machine in which the individual winding places may be removable and exchangeable. The winding machine only contains winding places. These winding places, while modular, are an integral structure. The driven components within the winding place are not modular. These winding places in the winding machine of Kamp correlate to the entire spinning station within the spinning machine in Wassenhoven, et al. Kamp does not show individual driven components within each winding place being exchangeable. Therefore, at best Kamp would only teach the exchanging of a whole spinning station including the winding and spinning units within that spinning station. Neither Wassenhoven, et al. nor Kamp disclose, teach, or suggest that individual driven components within the respective spinning station should be modularly structured and exchangeable.

For at least the reasons set forth above, independent claims 17, 26, 32, 43, and 44 are patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art and are allowable. Claims 18-25 depend from claim 17 and claims 27-31 depend from claim 26. Thus, claims 19-25

and 27-31 are also allowable. Further, claims 33-42 depend from claim 33 and claims 45-48 depend from claim 44. Therefore, claims 33-42 and 45-48 are also allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at his convenience to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

David M. Sigmon
Registration No. 52,224

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.
P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
(864) 271-1592
Fax: (864) 233-7342

Date: October 6, 2005